Refugees and energy access,

EnDev’s position and capacities

# *Discussion paper for the EnDev Governing Board, May 2016*

# Summary

At its meeting in Oslo, 16-17 November 2015, the EnDev board raised the political interest in the refugees topic and discussed whether and in what way EnDev could play a role in it. This paper gives a general overview of energy access in refugee situations including actual initiatives, describes the challenge of bridging humanitarian aid and development agenda’s, and sketches ways in which EnDev may add value to the agenda.

In short, energy access is structurally under-addressed in most refugee situations. It is not part of the standard UNHCR camp planning, is underserved in nearly all refugee situations or provided by humanitarian aid organisations without focus on long-term sustainability and transition aid. This leads to undesired coping mechanisms and risks to safety, food security, environment, as well as a general lack of long-term perspectives. Awareness about this gap is growing amongst the humanitarian aid community (UNHCR, relief organizations), but in spite of initiatives chaired by the Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves (SAFE) and led by Chatham House (Moving Energy Initiative) so far the divide with the development practitioners is not closed. Also in terms of funding for energy access the humanitarian aid community allocates by far insufficient means and UNHCR does not have its own budget for energy.

Yet close to 60 million people are officially defined as refugees, the majority (85%) in Sub-Sahara Africa of which almost 9 million live in camps. Average time spent by refugees in camps is 17 years, revealing that in spite of host governments’ official position to not formalise settlements these are -in fact- communities with principle opportunities for commerce, trade, and craft in which energy access plays a crucial role. There are however special challenges when it comes for instance to affordability of energy services and the dependency on relief measures, coordination with humanitarian aid organizations, UNHCR and host government, the interaction with host communities and human capacity.

Although overlaps definitely exist the two extremes of the spectrum can be given as emergency relief situations and protracted settlements. In the first the humanitarian aid agenda prevails and development programs like EnDev could merely add technical advice to the current implementers but not act as implementer itself. This is for instance the case with the current Syrian crisis where refugees move to EU countries or stay in camps in the region. A development agenda makes sense in case the camps would become formalised (which is usually not yet the case), in transitional aid programmes or in case of reconstruction after peace in the region is restored. Between the extremes many different settings occur, though. In Jordan for instance more refugees live in urban areas than in UNHCR camps, making it much more likely for refugees to settle and seek for development. Although the Syrian crisis and its direct effects on the region and the EU catch the primary attention, it is however only a tip of the iceberg. The majority of displaced persons are outside of the Syrian crisis and the numbers will constantly increase in the years to come due to conflicts, climate change and other humanitarian crises. Actual examples are in Mali and the El Nino related food shortage in Ethiopia, Malawi and Zimbabwe.

EnDev is well equipped and experienced to work in weak market environments, is recognized for its expertise in initial discussions with UNHCR and humanitarian aid organizations, and may be able to fill the energy access gap from emergency aid through transitional aid to development. Nevertheless circumstances and enabling environments in refugee situations, as well as the many different settlement types and population require new cooperation and partnerships, and new and tailor made approaches which might build on EnDev’s pro-poor market approach, but cannot copy them without adaptation. Embarking on the refugee agenda will require a parallel learning and implementation trajectory. Concrete possible ways forward could encompass:

* A close exchange and cooperation, possibly even participation, with Chatham House’s Moving Energy Initiative and/or UN/GACC SAFE initiative
* A 2 year bi-country learning and implementation program in Kenya and Uganda, possibly expanding towards Ethiopia, Rwanda, Burkina Faso and Mali
* A fast track pilot in Kenya developing and implementing measures for basic energy services such as stove production, lighting and basic electricity supply as well as dealing with the fuelwood supply chain
* Providing technical assistance to on-going transitional aid programs, for instance in DRC.

EnDev management cautions that engaging in a refugee agenda should not be limited to some pilots only, but should be of a structural nature if approaches prove successful. Too many actors who implement often uncoordinated with other stakeholders differening and contradicting approaches have repeatedly spoiled market potentials in refugee settlements. Besides, expectations and collaboration should be carefully managed with beneficiaries, implementers, humanitarian organisations and host governments. Identifying, attracting and allocating funds for such a structural engagement are essential.

EnDev management hence proposes to discuss this at the next Governing Board meeting, 10-11 May in Bern, and asks the EnDev Governing Board to decide on the following questions:

# Requested Governing Board Decisions

1. The governing board invites EnDev to further develop a refugee component under EnDev, and mandates EnDev management to further explore and engage in partnership with MEI and SAFE initiative.
2. The governing board invites EnDev to design implementing and learning measures for the refugee context under the current EnDev criteria and mandate, and propose these measures to the board in the 2017 Annual Planning document.
3. EnDev management without prior board consultation can initiate smaller pilot measures or cooperation with other programs.
4. The governing board members establishes links within their respective ministries to the departments dealing with the refugee issue or humanitarian as well as transitional aid and supports EnDev management by sharing information on internal policies and budgets.
5. Governing Board members and EnDev management jointly will explore ways to liaise with UNHCR and explore funding allocations for energy practitioners within the humanitarian aid system

# Introduction

At its meeting in Oslo, 16-17 November 2015, the EnDev board raised the political interest in the refugees topic and discussed whether and in what way the program could play a role in it. 2016 new sector policies to align energy issues with the refugee issue and funding allocations in the respective donor countries are expected to align to this issue. EnDev management was invited to prepare a paper on the topic for discussion in the next Governing Board meeting.

# Refugees and energy access

In 2015, close to 60 million people worldwide are officially defined by UNHCR as refugees or internally displaced persons, of which almost 9 million live in camps. Others settle or roam in rural areas, reside in urban informal settlements, live on designated plots of land or make a living constantly on the move. More than 85 % of the refugees live in the developing world, especially in Sub-Sahara Africa. Refugee settlements come in many forms and shapes, including but not only in UNHCR established tent camps.

As per UNHCR only 11% of camp population has access to electricity for basic energy services such as lighting, cooling and communication affecting safety, health and general quality of life. In addition, the need for cooking fuels is considerable, estimated at 3,5 MTOE per year, mainly firewood and charcoal, although especially in the West Asian refugee camps (Jordan, Turkey, Lebanon) a significant share of LPG is used. In most camps inefficient cooking methods are applied, unnecessarily increasing fuel demand. What is not collected comes at high costs, often considerably higher than for the host community. Most of the costs are borne by the refugees themselves (at least 200$ per year per household[[1]](#footnote-1)), partly supplemented by humanitarian organizations or local government. In some cases trading food for fuel, leading to malnutrition, occurs. In addition, open fire cooking severely impacts health and safety. Diesel generators mostly power camp facilities such as hospitals, schools and offices with diesel brought in over large distances at high costs (for Kenyan Dadaab camp diesel costs are estimated as high as 2,3 million $ per year). The situation outside the camps varies, but similar energy access deficits occur.

Basic energy services are not part of the standard design of UNHCR’s refugee settlements, which basic functions are limited to water, food and shelter. Renewable energy sources to power camp infrastructure are hardly considered, especially in the camps in Sub Sahara Africa.

This approach is appraised even by UNHCR as a missing link in dealing with refugees in emergency situations and the need to deal with programmes such as EnDev is frankly expressed. UNHCR for instance only employs three experts globally who are dealing with energy and hence the provision of basic energy services to refugee households is usually left to NGOs, humanitarian aid organizations, external consultants or the host countries. The expertise international development programmes such as EnDev have made in energy access measures so far has not been harnessed and is not yielded in the refugee context. The link to local energy markets and local institutions dealing with energy supply outside the camps is generally missing. Formal room for private sector investing in infrastructure, distribution, marketing is in general completely absent, let alone the application of private sector risk mitigating instruments (market intelligence, financial guarantees, performance contracts), including in protracted settlements. Energy for productive use is usually not seen as a need for the refugees leading to the illegal usage of diesel generators and stealing of electricity from the local grid in the neighbourhoods of the camps.

Efforts to improve energy access in the settlements in the past have been often piecemeal, technology driven, and have proved as a rule as unsustainable. No structural approach to provide energy access has so far been designed and implemented to scale, in spite of some promising pilots that lacked however structural follow-up, and of recently risen awareness in the humanitarian community about the importance of energy access. The challenges are manifold and include lack of awareness, donor depending attitudes, lack of (diversified) payment models and risk mitigation instruments, host-refugee interaction, a lack of coordination on the energy agenda between humanitarian organizations, and overcoming the mechanism of only short term implementation planning for refugee camp interventions.

# Current initiatives

Lately UNHCR and humanitarian aid organizations show an increased interest in enhancing their work on energy access and renewable energy. In discussions between EnDev and UNHCR it was expressed that basic energy services are a growing concern, but that successful approaches and experience from the field of international development cooperation, including ones in which private sector can play a role, are scarce or not available. UNHCR has mentioned its interest in further exchange with EnDev. The Dutch Relief Alliance, a group of humanitarian organizations aligning approaches both towards donors and in the field shows interest in exploring cooperation with EnDev as well as organisations such as Norwegian Refugee Council or Welthungerhilfe. In Kenya GIZ’s Support to Refugees and Host Communities (GIZ SIF) program considers including energy as a new component and is interested in EnDev’s approaches and cooperation for implementation. Also in the context of transitional aid for the support of internally displaced persons (IDPs) in the Eastern part of the Democratic Republic of Congo, cooperation with EnDev in the field of clean cooking has just been proposed to the funding ministry (which could be taken care of by the EnDev project in Burundi). Under the WB-Access program opportunities to engage on an energy access agenda in refugee camps are also being investigated.

In 2014 UNHCR released its [Global Strategy for Safe Access to Fuel and Energy (SAFE) 2014-2018](http://www.unhcr.org/530f11ee6.html) in which it acknowledges the importance of reliable access to basic energy services in refugee situations, focussing in particular on cooking and lighting needs, and institutional energy in camps. Stoves, both local and industrial products, solar energy products and mini-grids are part of the strategy as well as the usage of solar water heaters. In cases where solid biomass is still considered a viable option reduction of fuel consumption, as well woodlot management and reforestation are considered. The strategy calls for coordination, innovation and partnerships including with the private sector without however being specific. The strategy aims for camp situations in a number of focus countries between 2014-2018, expanding later to other countries and non-camp locations for forcibly displaced persons.

In parallel, and supporting the UNHCR the *SAFE initiative* aims to incorporate basic energy needs broadly in refugee and IDP programs via “sharing information and improving coordination, developing tools and capacity for energy access in humanitarian situations, and M&E, general advocacy and resource mobilization.” [SAFE’s steering committee](http://www.safefuelandenergy.org/about/working-group.cfm) is formed by FAO, the Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves, UNHCR, UNICEF, WFP, and Women's Refugee Commission amongst others. GACC chairs the working group and leads the daily work. Organizations participate in the SAFE initiative working group as members of the steering committee, as associate members, or as member of the SAFE “community”, depending on the level of active contribution.

EnDev already has cooperated with the SAFE network when the earthquake in Nepal occurred in April 2015. Due to a notice from the pico-PV private sector enterprise Wakawaka, EnDev learnt about the company’s interest to cooperate with a partner in the country who could facilitate the import and distribution of their products for earthquake victims. EnDev thus supported the import of about 7,000 solar lanterns, partly donated to the Government of Nepal and to JICA, but partly also purchased by a GIZ reconstruction project. All products have meanwhile been distributed to victims of the earthquake.

In 2015 UK’s Chatham House, in cooperation with DFID, Norwegian Refugee Council, GVEP, Practical Action and UNHCR, launched the *Moving Energy Initiative* (MEI). The main goal of MEI is to seek solutions which meet the energy needs of refugees and internally displaced persons (IDPs) in a manner that reduces costs, is safe, healthy and respectful; that also benefits host countries and communities; and where possible creates opportunities for income generation and knowledge transfer to tackle energy poverty and sustainability. MEI’s idea is that sustainable energy solutions generate many benefits for camp inhabitants, hosts, camp operators, and for the environment. The initiative targets especially at cutting costs, reducing emissions and extending energy solutions to the local communities.

In November 2015 Chatham House launched its publication “[Heat, Light and Power for Refugees: Saving Lives, Reducing Costs](https://www.chathamhouse.org/publication/heat-light-and-power-refugees-saving-lives-reducing-costs#sthash.JnA7foB4.dpuf)”, which profoundly assesses the problems related to energy in the refugee context and identifies challenges and potential solutions. MEI intends to promote larger awareness for the subject on a global level and to contribute to the identification and demonstration of workable solutions through learning by doing projects in Jordan, Kenya and Burkina Faso.

MEI approached EnDev in this context for experience sharing and cooperating in the EnDev countries Kenya and Burkina Faso. MEI encourages the humanitarian aid organisations to change their assistance modalities from short-term perspective to a long-term approach, based on the finding that refugees spend in average 17 years in refugee camps. In spite of host country governments’ hesitation to consider refugee camps as a long-term solution, a longer-term provision of renewable energy facilities would considerably contribute to protecting the environment and thus also contribute to mitigating climate change contribution factors.

EnDev was also invited in MEI’s workshop on “Refugees and energy resilience in Jordan” in Amman in April 2016 which was also supported by DGIS. EnDev presented its work and market development approach in relation to the current refugee debate and provided the participants with information and data on energy access.

Although it appears that energy access is increasingly receiving attention in the humanitarian aid agenda successful approaches at scale still need to be demonstrated. In emergency relief situations the provision of improved stoves and solar lanterns slowly starts to grow (f.i. Nepal). Long term sustainable solutions in more protracted settings, bringing together aid and development agendas, are however few. Involved organizations and initiatives are in a phase of searching for successful approaches, piloting and implementing relatively small size projects and researching alternatives. Private sector involvement and the link to national energy planning are seen as an important part of the solution, but the humanitarian aid community is struggling how to engage them in what essentially are extremely weak market environments. EnDev traditionally works in weak rural markets, strengthening local and involving national and international private sector and developing market mechanisms benefitting the poor and vulnerable, and may be in a good position to contribute with its expertise to the discussion and in finding more effective energy solutions in refugee camps. EnDev may also contribute with its experience in promoting productive use of energy in and around the camps, a topic that is very important for local economic development and for enhancing the developing chances of refugees being based in camps in the long-term.

# “Linking to the refugee agenda, connecting short term relief to long-term human development”

Europe received close to a million asylum applications in 2015, mainly of refugees from the Syrian, Iraqi and Afghan conflict areas. Expectations for 2016, in spite of recent political and financial agreements with EU border countries, are that again large amounts of refugees and migrants try to enter the EU. EU and donor countries policies focus on controlling migrant flows, provide humanitarian shelter within the conflict regions and stimulate livelihood and development in regions with high densities of displaced persons to avoid further migration to Europe or on the continent. On a global level, the current refugee flows to the EU are a tragic tip of the iceberg.

The majority of displaced persons stay already in or very near the crisis region. Mid 2015 for instance, no less than 7,6 million Syrians were displaced, of which 4,4 million outside Syria in for instance Jordan and Lebanon (one in four inhabitants is now Syrian), and in particular Turkey since early 2016. It is the same in other crisis areas like Somalia, South Sudan, and the CAR, where refugees are hosted in neighbouring countries like Kenya and Uganda. Of the nearly 60 million displaced people, 86% are in developing countries with 10 countries hosting 60% of the world’s refugees. The situation is persistent. Nearly half of the refugees under UNHCR’s mandate are in “protracted” situations in which 25,000 or more individuals have been refugees in a host country for five or more years. As of 2014, the average duration of these situations had reached 25 years. The world’s largest refugee camp, the Kenyan Dadaab was opened in 1990 and holds over 350.000 people.

Often denied formal acknowledgement by national or local authorities many of these protected settlements are permanent. They are mostly dependent on outside funding from UNHCR, donors and humanitarian organizations and family remittances, although especially in older settlements some commerce is thriving. Economic perspectives of refugees in all types of refugee settlements are however low, stimulating further migration.

Besides conflict and insecurity, natural disaster, and lack of economic perspective the 2015 COP21 in Paris warned about the threat of climate change displacing ever-larger parts of populations because of droughts, flooding and resource conflicts, pushing the numbers of people in refugee settlements and seeking for new economic opportunities in prosperous parts of the world, including the EU, to even higher levels. A solution to the current Syrian crisis may be critically urgent, in the longer term migration of large population groups, including to Europe will remain an issue of growing concern.

Dealing with this issue requires cooperation between two agenda’s, the humanitarian aid and the development agenda. First relief, safety, shelter and food (and energy) are critical humanitarian needs and should be addressed under the umbrella of the UNHCR. Spurring economic growth in settlements and host communities, allowing migrants to build a new life is a long-term agenda, in non-refugee situations typically supported by development organizations. In most refugee situations of today however humanitarian approaches dominate, further protracting the need for external support.

Energy is a crucial factor in both agenda’s. In humanitarian relief situations energy is needed for cooking, for lighting, for communication and for camp facilities. However, as energy provision appears not to be included in the design of the settlements the baseline situation is always insufficient, see for instance below excerpt from the 2013 UNHCR report on Kenya. To support development and growth energy is a critical contributor to productivity, varying from very small activities like lighting for shops, cooking for restaurants until semi-industrial production of wood or metal product, or services like grinding, milling etc. The agenda for this development is however far more complex since it involves not only the provision of energy, but also access to markets, vocational skills, and financing and private sector involvement.

[**From: UNHCR 2013 Global Report: Kenya**](http://www.unhcr.org/539809efb.pdf)

**Goal: Population has sufficient access to energy**

Indicators:

% of households in Kakuma camp with access to modern energy: goal 2013 50%; results 2013: 16%;

% of households in Dadaab camp using biomass energy: goal 2013: 100%; results 2013 67%;

In Dadaab, 4,145 tonnes of wood, procured in an eco-friendly manner, was distributed by two partners to vulnerable households, as well as to public institutions such as schools and hospitals. Available firewood could cover only two-and-a-half months of the household energy demand in Dadaab. The 9,509 energy saving stoves provided in 2013 did not bridge the existing gap.

In Kakuma, UNHCR could only supply 10kg of firewood per person, per month for only six months.

In both locations provisions were however by far insufficient. As a result, refugees needed to develop other coping mechanisms to meet their domestic energy requirements, such as selling their food rations to buy extra firewood.

# How can EnDev add value?

## Experience in refugee situations and in pro-poor markets

In a number of its countries EnDev implementers have made early experience with refugees. In Ethiopia EnDev stove producers have supplied cookstoves to UNHCR projects. In Kenya, both in Dadaab and Kakuma a previous UNCHR-BMZ partnership program installed and operated stove production centres focusing strictly on the Maendeleo stove. After termination of the program both centres were handed over to local NGOs which are subsidized by UNHCR and produce below the capacities. The new BMZ GIZ project Support to Refugees and Host Communities (GIZ SIF) supported a local NGO (LOKADO) in revitalizing the centre in Kakuma to produce and distribute a total of 4,200 stoves, which are fully paid by GIZ SIF. The centre, however, does not make use of its potential and produces far below its capacity, and there is no sign that LOKADO might apply a market oriented approach. In Uganda short term interventions were made together with NGO Welthungerhilfe in a pilot to set up local stove production in a refugee settlement. The pilot produced mediocre results in terms of numbers of stoves (although appreciated for their appropriateness to the local conditions) but did provide valuable lessons on cooperation between development and aid organizations, project preparation with an eye on market development rather than “just” technical capacity building, and timeframes of interventions.

From these interventions a number of valuable lessons were drawn that would lay a basis for a possible future intervention. These are:

1. Energy should be integrated in the design and day-to-day evaluation of refugee settlements. Its interaction with environment (de- and afforestation), food (undercooking or selling) and stability (pressure on host community environment, potential conflicts with existing charcoal actors) is critical.
2. Carefully prepare settlement energy strategies and not simply push for certain interventions/technologies. This is not so different from normal market development but from the often very dense population in camps and settlements market spoilage will go extremely fast. Look, just like any other market, into baseline situation, consumer preferences (willingness), financial aspects (affordability), consumer behavior (appropriateness), but also into other stakeholders intervention approaches.
3. Do not engage in pilots without coordination with other donors and without planning a structural follow-up. Building market structures takes time; “abandoned” pilots may deliver valuable info for the short term but will spoil the market for the longer term[[2]](#footnote-2).
4. There are differences in affordability between refugees. Offer diversified consumer payment models, i.e. cash, labor (tree planting); both can be “as you go”.
5. There often is however a weak financial basis in settlements and camps. On this basis entrepreneurship can be build. Develop strategies for engaging refugees and host communities “up the energy value chain”, i.e. in maintenance and repair, sales and promotion, but also in small productive activities (building on, expanding what is already there, like kiosks) and make use of refugees’ skills and their already existing qualifications.
6. Engage host communities properly. Provide equal opportunities as to refugees at least when it comes to training, energy access, productive activities
7. Political will and aid coordination is crucial. Governments and donors on the one hand need to accept the long term perspective of the settlements, on the other need, together with UNHCR, to push for coordination amongst the many humanitarian organizations involved and avoid contradicting interventions in (also) the energy field.
8. In the Humanitarian Aid perspective, refugee camps are of temporary nature and are not defined for building up long term institutional characteristics, in order to avoid that refugee-camp-inhabitants will develop a passive long term support receiving mentality. While recognizing the validity of this approach, it is known that refugees and IDPs often stay for many years in camps. Hence a longer term planning for energy infrastructure is crucial, in order to avoid sources of conflicts with the hosting communities, when it comes to competition for fuelwood supply or privileged access to subsidized energy technology (apart from the objective to avoid exploitation of vegetation with all know consequences).
9. While still aiming to maintain the temporary nature of a settlement structure and support refugees and IDPs to develop skills which enable them to move on to livelihoods outside of refugee camps, skill development such as on improved cookstoves production can help refugees to build up an existence for their self-dependence.

Except for this specific experience and as a basis, EnDev already works dedicatedly in weak markets, developing local production capacity, designing business models for local entrepreneurs, setting up and strengthening last mile distribution channels, raising awareness and designing promotion campaigns. EnDev is also well equipped and experienced to support local, national and international private sector with capacity building and enabling activities, and mitigating their risks in doing business in environments with low consumer awareness and financial capabilities.

### Options and prerequisites for EnDev engagement

There is an apparent need (and struggle) of the humanitarian aid community to link humanitarian approach with development approaches such as promoted by EnDev for energy access in especially protracted refugee situations[[3]](#footnote-3). EnDev, although still with limited experience in refugee situations has substantial expertise in the initiation and development of pro-poor and fragile markets, and is hence equipped with the right tools and instruments to add value. EnDev however does not provide a one fit for all solution but counts on its experience made in 25 countries globally. Refugee situations are diverse, complex and provide certain challenges EnDev needs to learn about despite of its elaborate experience in weak market situations. As much as humanitarian organizations face difficulties developing sustainable energy solutions, EnDev may have to adapt to the specific refugee settings. A structured approach combined with strategic partnerships amongst the involved stakeholders is needed to develop, analyse and role out approaches that lead to more sustainable solutions.

It is advisable to align EnDev with UNHCR, the recently launched initiatives such as SAFE and MEI before starting to add this as a new EnDev component. EnDev hence needs a clear mandate by the governing board to enter into these partnerships as well as the support by the donor countries to link with the UNHCR system and the host countries before the implementing measures are commenced. Before designing measures in the refugee context it is also required that EnDev partners with humanitarian aid organisations and NGOs working in the respective country and harmonise the different approaches with the goal of delivering energy solutions effectively and at best in a sustainable manner.

The work in the refugee context will require new partnerships intensive capacity building, the adaptation of financing and risk mitigation instruments, developing value chains, including fuel chains that balance benefits for refugees and for hosts, as examples. A refugee component within EnDev may not immediately deliver outcomes according to current EnDev standards, nor at EnDev’s current costs efficiency. EnDev may enter the refugee camps only after an emergency situation is overcome and the transition towards a stable and formalised situation with long term energy planning is possible. The long-term impact and lessons learned could nevertheless be substantial including, although attribution will be hard to measure, on future migration.

*From the current financial situation and consequently the investment strategy of the program EnDev management advises the board to only engage on this agenda however in case EnDev is provided by the mandate and sufficient funding additional to the regular EnDev allocations.*

#### 1. Cooperate with international initiatives

Both the MEI and SAFE initiatives aim to develop and share lessons on good (and bad) practices in energy access in refugee situations and to feed these in the international aid community. MEI works strongly on the analytical side, SAFE aims to support the practical implementation of humanitarian aid organizations and the UN SAFE strategy. Energy practitioners are members of both initiatives, although to a limited extend. In case EnDev management is mandated by the governing board to conduct activities on this agenda it would generate valuable and additional lessons at the grass root level from an energy implementer’s point of view, rooted in its field experience from development cooperation worldwide. EnDev would pursue sustainable, solutions based on pro-poor market development, in particular aiming to involve the private sector and to build sustainable energy value chains, adding unique value and substantial expertise to the current initiatives. In addition EnDev could explore the productive use agenda to stimulate economic development and employment.

#### 2. Implementation options

###### 2.1. A (two year) implementation program with a strong learning component

EnDev management was repeatedly requested not to initiate any pilots without the perspective of a more structural engagement. Over the years refugees were exposed to many pilots that were either ill-designed, technology driven, or even in cases of proper design supported for too short periods of time to deliver sustainable results. As a result, market spoilage, mistrust, an attitude of *waiting for the next donor* have developed further complicating real sustainable solutions.

EnDev management sees good opportunities for a learning and development program though, where interventions and technology choice are based and planned on thorough market and consumer preference assessments, where local capacity is being build and balanced with necessary “outside” private sector, where different business and consumer finance models can be explored. Such a program, equipped with a well-structured evaluation component would a) feed into the global initiatives of MEI and SAFE and therefore directly into the humanitarian aid community, and b) prepare the ground for a further role out to scale within EnDev. The program would initially focus Kenya and Uganda to build on the existing experience, contacts (GIZ-SIF, DRA) and opportunities of the country teams in these countries and to be able to demonstrate different approaches in different settings simultaneously. Later, it could expand its activities in other countries like Ethiopia and Mali, based on the experiences in the pilot countries.

###### 2.2. Fast track a pilot as input for the implementation program

Allocating necessary funds, designing the program described above, and preparing/convincing cooperation partners needs time and may require further evidence. EnDev Kenya together with the GIZ SIF designed a pilot intervention to provide the necessary information on (market based) approaches for household cooking and lighting solutions in Kakuma refugee settlements, including the possible set-up of a new biomass fuel chain from the evasive Prosopis Juliflora species. This information could form the basis of the before mentioned implementation program.

###### 2.3. Informal cooperation with ongoing transitional aid interventions with the potential to future scaling up

So far informal support to a newly planned regular transitional aid project for the support of IDPs together with their host communities in the DRC through technical advise for the introduction of clean cooking technology (capacitating local stove producers) could be scaled up with direct support through EnDev in future. This allows to start working through newly established project structures and delivery mechanisms outside of the EnDev program and to benefit from options for direct scaled up activities, once the structures will be established on the ground.

1. reference [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. As an example, a recent evaluation of solar street lighting in Kakuma revealed that actually none of the installed lights, either in the camp nor in Kakuma town, were operating because of bad sizing, dead batteries and poor maintenance [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Except for household solutions, settlement infrastructure is high on the agenda of humanitarian organizations. Hospitals and other facilities are now powered by expensive diesel generators. Experience with renewable energy is low resulting in design failures or general hesitance. EnDev’s experience from projects in e.g. Ethiopia or Liberia could be valuable. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)